

VOLUME 15

NUMBER 7

PRICE 71p



# Christian Order

## Summary of Contents for July 1974

THE CHURCH AND REVOLUTION

*The Editor*

THE ENEMY WITHIN THE GATE

*Rev. John McKee*

DR. BAUM COMES TO TOWN

*David Boyce*

WILL THE NICENE CREED DISAPPEAR?.

*Anthony Witherspoon*

THE WINDSOR AGREEMENT

*Michael Davies*

THE PRINCIPLE OF SUBSIDIARITY

*J. M. Jackson*

## THIS IS THE FAITH

Father Ripley's wonderful book, completely revised and brought up to date incorporating the teaching of Vatican II. 317 pages. Hard back cover in colour.

**Price £3.00 per copy Post free U.K.**

**OBTAINABLE FROM:** Print Origination, Orrell Mount, Hawthorne Road, Bootle, Lancs., Ltd., 6NS.

## The St. Peter Catechism

- States what Catholics believe and do.
- A manual of instruction.
- A guide book for teachers.
- A reference book for everyone.
- Uses traditional formulas but also quotations from Vat. II. 64 pages, 669 Questions & Answers, page size 8 $\frac{1}{4}$  x 5 $\frac{3}{4}$ .

**Price 35p per copy Post free U.K.**

## CHALLENGE TO BRITAIN

An expert and totally objective run-down of the structure, the professionals and the devotees of the Communist Party of Great Britain. Everyone and everything is here in this superb book of reference, now in its second printing.

**Price £1.00.**

Obtainable from:

**Common Cause Publications Ltd.,**  
13 Goodwin's Court, St. Martin's Lane,  
London, WC2 N4LL.

# Contents

Page

|     |  |                              |
|-----|--|------------------------------|
| 386 | DIVIDED CHURCH   | <i>The Editor</i>            |
| 388 | WILL THE NICENE CREED<br>DISAPPEAR?                                  | <i>Anthony Witherspoon</i>   |
| 391 | "THE ENEMY WITHIN THE<br>GATE"                                       | <i>Rev. John McKee</i>       |
| 400 | DR. BAUM COMES TO<br>TOWN  | <i>David Boyce</i>           |
| 407 | READINGS AT MASS   | <i>Francis Fenn, S.J.</i>    |
| 410 | THE CHURCH AND<br>REVOLUTION<br>I: IN DENIAL OF CATHOLIC<br>TEACHING | <i>The Editor</i>            |
| 422 | THE PRINCIPLE OF<br>SUBSIDIARITY                                     | <i>J. M. Jackson</i>         |
| 433 | ANY QUESTIONS?   | <i>William Lawson, S.J.</i>  |
| 438 | BOOK REVIEW  | <i>The Windsor Agreement</i> |

**If You Change Your Address:**  
Please let us know two or three weeks ahead if possible and please send us both new and old addresses. Thank you.

monthly magazine devoted to the promulgation of Catholic Social Teaching and incisive comment on current affairs in Church and State; at home and abroad; in the political, social and industrial fields.

It is published by Father Paul Crane, S.J., from 65, Belgrave Road, London, S.W.1. This is the sole postal address to which all communications concerning *Christian Order* should be sent.

*Christian Order* is obtainable only by subscription and from this address. In the case of those desiring more than one copy, these are obtainable at the subscription rate and should be paid for in advance.

The annual subscription to *Christian Order* is £1 in the United Kingdom and Republic of Ireland; \$3.00 in the United States, Canada and Australia; elsewhere, according to the approximate sterling rate of exchange, in the currency of the country concerned or any convenient currency.

# Christian Order

EDITED BY

Paul Crane SJ

---

VOLUME 15

JULY, 1974

NUMBER 7

---

## Divided Church

THE EDITOR

ONCE again, this month, let us look at the question of paradox within the post-conciliar Church and consider it within the context of yet another witch-word on the lips of progressives today—"community". Rarely have we been exhorted so often to build it as in the past few years; yet, rarely have we been so divided and especially by the efforts of those who insist, as they do what they do, that they are trying only to unite us.

The trouble, of course, is that they are trying to unite us on their terms, not those of God's truth. What they forget is that community is the outcome of growth round an ideal and that, once the ideal is clouded through the attempted imposition on the Faithful of alien and false ideas and growth divorced from traditional roots in the interests of rapid change, unity and, with it, community is fragmented. And responsibility for the fragmenting must be made to lie with those who, in the name of a bogus pluralism, have sought to impose a new secularist teaching on Catholics in place of their Faith and to force them, in pursuit of its bogus ideals, to wrench their lives out of that traditional context of growth which is theirs by right as children of God, making their way forward, as their Fathers have done before them, with the help of His Grace. Thus there is a split where once there was unity, so that what



you have now is a divided Church.

Ultimate responsibility for it must, I am afraid, be made to rest with Authority in the Church. It cannot be placed anywhere else. So long as those within the Church, who want the unity that means community on their terms, not those of God, are allowed to pillage truth and make a mockery of it at the expense of the Faithful; so long as this process continues, the Church will continue to be rent with divisions and the final crunch, when it does come—as come it must—all the harder to meet. One day, the Bishops will have to take a stand, insisting, in absolute loyalty to the Holy See, that the nonsense must end; which means that secularizing theologians must be put out of court, catechetical centres purged, religious instruction in schools and training colleges made to accord with a well-defined and orthodox syllabus sanctioned by Authority, seminaries and houses of study of religious orders given a thorough theological cleansing, liturgical experimenters sent packing, commissions, committees and councils kept from involving the Church as a partisan in the arid minutiae of secular affairs.

The line is clear enough. It is the very least that requires to be done if unity and, with it, community is to be regained within the Church. Both have been shattered. Divisions and strife have replaced the quiet—almost subconscious—pull-together of former days. The Bishops reaction so far to this splintering of unity amongst us has been little removed from that of spectators at a football match, contemplating the struggle and nothing more. Now the time has come for them to act. And would they make a start, please, by showing, at the very least, the same regard for those who seek to defend the Faith as they do towards those, who appear to many of us to be working to destroy it? These words may seem hard. They represent the thoughts of many that lie too deep, not only for words, but also for tears. Unity lies only in truth. What one asks is that the Bishops should uphold it. Papering over cracks is not a rewarding business.

This short article by Anthony Witherspoon can be seen as reinforcing what he had to say in the June number of *Christian Order*. It deserves careful study. It is reprinted, with due acknowledgements, from *Christian Communications*, 23 Main Street, Ottawa, K1S 1C4, Canada.

## Will the Nicene Creed Disappear ?

ANTHONY WITHERSPOON

THE first two documents issued by the Second Vatican Council were on the profane and sacred means of communication, namely the decree *Inter Mirifica* and the Constitution on the Liturgy. They were promulgated together on December 4th, 1963 by Paul VI who remarked that this coincidence "clearly witnesses how the Church joins her exterior life to an interior life, her activity to meditation, her apostolate to prayer".

Nothing remarkable was done, as far as we know, to commemorate the 10th anniversary of *Inter Mirifica*. But a remarkable meeting of "leading liturgical experts" took place at Scottsdale, Arizona, U.S.A. to decide how the movement of reform in liturgy initiated by Vatican II could become more "transformational", more "revolutionary" and more "in discontinuity with the past". It was decided to form a professional association to make sure that the job is done right.

The meeting was sponsored by *Theological Studies*, a quarterly edited by Walter Burghardt, S.J., of Woodstock, a Jesuit theological seminary that has recently been discontinued.

Father Burghardt gave the keynote address on how to

be revolutionary within the framework of a "reform theology based on historical thinking".

To revolve is to go round in a circle. If, as in this case the circling has to be in the realm of history, the question is to which point of departure in the past should the new revolution return?

In order to answer this question we have to remember that the liturgy is the sacramental expression of faith (*lex orandi—lex credendi*). During the early formative period of the Catholic liturgy, what faith did it come to express? In this, the Council of Nicaea in 325 was decisive. The Nicene creed originated at this Council and it was no sooner formulated than it was called into question by the Arian theologians and the dispute went on for most of the 4th century. What was challenged was the unequivocal affirmation of the divinity of Christ. However, the Nicene creed finally prevailed as the expression of Catholic faith, especially after the Council of Constantinople in 381, and was soon incorporated into the liturgy of the Mass where it has remained ever since.

If a *reformative* period is now to be professionally undertaken, and if it is to be of a revolutionary character, then the point of departure on which it must revolve cannot be other than the Nicene creed. For what can be more revolutionary than calling this creed into question again and perhaps succeeding this time, where the Arians failed?

Father Burghardt posed to the new American Liturgical Association (composed of professors, liturgical magazine editors and executives of national and diocesan liturgical offices) this question:

"Does the Nicene-Constantinopolitan Creed express the living Faith of today's Christian or is it a spiritless, joyless set of outmoded words that safeguard orthodoxy and silence doxology (praise)?"

A rhetorical question, no doubt, which does not reveal what Father Burghardt himself has in mind. In any event, when the answers of our leading liturgists and theologians have been received, it is to be hoped that the bishops will



compare them carefully with the answers given by the Arian theologians in the 4th century. If they neglect to do this, they may find themselves being led around by the (g)nose.

According to chapter V of Monika Hellwig's book *What are the Theologians Saying?*, the theologians are posing very serious questions indeed about the Nicene creed. Apparently it contains some affirmations that are historically verifiable, and others that are only interpretations. So what are we to believe? Is He, or is He not divine? Only God can know for sure. All we know is that Jesus is a man, and maybe our experience of him as man can lead us to an understanding that He is divine. Such is what Monika thinks the theologians are saying.

Meanwhile in Canada, the question has been posed about the survival of the Nicene creed and this apparently depends on its ecumenical worth. It has now become optional together with the Apostles' creed. According to the Canadian missalette *Living with Christ* (December, 1973), the Apostles' creed "is intended for all English-speaking Christians everywhere". So it clearly has a decided ecumenical advantage over the Nicene creed which could not be used by "all English-speaking Christians everywhere", for many of them disbelieve the divinity of Christ and will therefore be embarrassed by the emphasis on this capital doctrine of Catholic Faith. However, there are some Christian churches apart from the Roman Catholic which use the Nicene creed and hence it has some ecumenical value which can prevent it from disappearing. In the Canadian, 1974, liturgical calendar published by the bishops' National Liturgical Office, there is this reassuring explanation:

"Because the Nicene creed is common to many (the French edition says *plusieurs* which only means "several") Christian churches, there is an ecumenical value in retaining its use on occasion. To make sure that it does not disappear from Catholic worship in Canada, its use is recommended on appropriate days of the year, as noted in this calendar".

The reader can draw his own conclusions.



It is with great pleasure that we introduce to our readers Father John McKee, that staunch defender of the Faith, and invite him to introduce to them his latest book, "The Enemy within the Gate".

## "The Enemy Within the Gate"

REV. JOHN MCKEE

THE above is the title of a book of mine (to be published in U.S.A. on or about May 16\*)—and Fr. Crane has been so kind as to invite me to sound a prefatory fanfare for the readers of *Christian Order*. I am delighted by the invitation, not only for the obvious reason, but especially because it is difficult today for a grizzled traditionalist to get into print. When controversy was raging over *Humanae Vitae* in 1968, a Fort Augustus monk wrote with satisfaction: "Almost all serious writing among Catholic theologians at present is being done by those who take a less rigid view of the limits of theological thought . . . The less liberal have been deflected to the negative activity of criticising the constructive work produced by others, and their criticism seldom appears in theological journals of any standing". Granting various presuppositions, the truth of the statement cannot be challenged, and "deflected" is a fair attribution of cause and effect. Pope Paul, for example, is "less liberal", and *Mysterium Fidei* was devoted to demolishing the constructions of others and rebuilding what they were demolishing, while *Humanae Vitae* unpicked the constructive views which, in Pope John's phrase, attacked human life at its source. To balance the deprecation of negative activity, we should recall what Dr. E. L. Mascall wrote in the preface

---

\*Lumen Christi Press, P.O. Box 13176, Houston, Texas 77019.

to *The Secularisation of Christianity*: "What I have sought to destroy is itself destructive, and what I have denied are negations". (I wish that I had had those words to hand in 1965 when Charles Davis found my critique of his Dutch transfiguration "harshly negative".) Since 1968, I should add, we have seen more clearly what is conveyed by the adjective "serious" before "writing" or by the phrase "of any standing" which qualified "theological journals".

Maisie Ward recounted in *Insurrection versus Resurrection* that neither her father nor mother "very much enjoyed the atmosphere of the Modernist group, which my mother especially felt to be a mutual admiration society living in a very small room". She was writing of the first phase of Modernism when Fr. Tyrrell backed "the collective subconsciousness of the People of God" against papacy and tradition, a subconsciousness which shrank effortlessly to a consensus of "the ablest and most cultivated minds", but she could equally have been describing the serious, ablest, most cultivated theologians of any standing with whom we are familiar today. Shortly before *Humanae Vitae* appeared, Fr. F. X. Murphy spoke of those who "feel that most of the Church's intelligent and conscientious thinkers have already settled the issue", while, close on its heels, Fr. N. Lash announced that "Most intellectual Catholics have already solved the problem. It remains a problem for people who haven't got the equipment—or the arrogance, if you like—to solve it for themselves", and Dom Sebastian Moore affirmed that the fallacy in the encyclical had "been exposed by every Catholic thinker of standing".

### *The Lepers*

So, automatically, millions of us, including the Pope, were classified as peasants and shown the tradesman's exit. It was unlikely that we were intelligent or even conscientious: we were short of equipment/arrogance, and, the Rock of Peter being demolished, we had no standing. We felt like Chesterton's King Alfred

"Who now upon the Wessex wold  
Hardly has feet to stand."

It was depressing, this Colosseum experience, with the literary lions devouring us poor Christians as never before. Worse still, our patch of wold has unexpectedly contracted in recent weeks in a way that should have caused an outcry in the Church in England. The secretary of the Catholic Truth Society, Mr. David Murphy, possibly acting under orders from higher up, has banned the sale of *Faith* in the C.T.S. shop. Now *Faith* is a staunchly orthodox magazine, warmed by love of the Church and therefore sometimes warm-tempered in her defence, and its banning is a blow to the spread of information about Catholic truth and the making-known of the faith, practice and history of the Catholic Church, which, according to the Directory, used to be the purpose of the C.T.S. Our grand old society, in the wrong hands, has reversed policy, continuing to sell periodicals which have been rebellious against the papacy and careless of tradition. (Was not even *one* bishop prepared to express publicly his disapproval? Must "Cabinet solidarity" always take precedence over justice's being done and being seen and heard to be done?)

And that is not all of it. By a remarkable piece of legerdemain, those who were classed as the Great-Theologically-Unwashed now find themselves passed over as a factious minority, and so we are disqualified on every count. We are the unintellectual mass, *and* we are the minority. The *Catholic Herald* for April 19th told us that the bishops in their meeting might decide not to blast the critics of the Agreed Statement on the Ministry, "in which case they will save the feelings of a minority . . ." There was no mention of any scientifically-conducted opinion poll which proved us to be in a minority, and there was indifference to the fact that the run-of-the-mill parson does not believe himself to be a Mass-priest (for long years there was a bounty on the Mass-priest's pelt), and the average Catholic heartily agrees with him. The *Herald* must have turned a "majority"



of the ablest minds into an absolute majority, and the rest of us into an unqualified minority.

All of which should make clear two things: first, why I am grateful to Fr. Crane for the hospitality of these columns, and, second, that the Church is riddled with Modernism, and this last is the concern of my book, its sub-title being *The Catholic Church and Renascent Modernism*.

### *Modernism Then and Now\**

I am confident that the average Catholic has not had the opportunity to read in detail what the early Modernists wrote, and study their careers, and therefore the first chapters of my book are devoted to making known their careers, their views and their implications. This is all the more necessary since the Modernist of today will naturally present, and is presenting, a twisted picture of them. If he shares their indifference to continuity of doctrine and doctrinal content, he must naturally see them as victims of Roman tyranny; if, like Tyrrell, he has a distorted notion of the nature of the Church, he will judge it an enormity if they were extruded from the institution to which he still clings. This must be borne in mind when we hear talk of "immanent heresy", that the man who is wrong about the Church may logically argue that he has no need to leave; thus Tyrrell saw the Catholic Church as probably "more responsible for all the schisms than the schismatics themselves", but he did not walk out. The outcome will, of course, be distress and there will result a critical hostility to, perhaps near-hatred of, the Church which should be loved as a mother; he may write from inside, but will look from outside, and will no longer be that beautiful thing, *filial*.

I am reminded here of what Isy von Hugel wrote of her brother-in-law, Baron Friedrich von Hugel, who had a "thing" against authority and served as the god-father of modernism, though more from naiveté than from modernist

---

\*See Lectures in New Zealand, in *Christian Order*, December 1972, for the Loisy-Tyrrell parentage of Fr. Hubert Richards' doctrine.

conviction. "Why, oh why," she wrote, ". . . did he say, and do so many strange things, so many seemingly unfilial things—or things at least not piercingly filial. I am thinking of the piercingness of Newman's filial words, even while the 'aggressive' and unseeing people were trying him so awfully. Freddy's words had never that tone . . ." Newman . . . 'piercingly filial' . . . it is a wonderful phrase and it has been in my mind as I read the contribution *Fact and Fiat: One Theme in the Modernist Crisis*, in the *Durham University Journal* for March of last year. It was written by a north of England priest, who contested *Humanae Vitae* in the pulpit, on the radio and on television, and is a perfect example of the way in which the second-wave Modernist completely misrepresents the events in the first wave. He shows little consciousness of the Church's duty to preserve the divinely-committed body of truth; no realisation of the inadequacies and half-baked scholarship of men like Tyrrell. Curiously, with talk of *fact* as against *fiat*, the Church's blindness to the "dimension of history", etc., one would take it that a man of Tyrrell's stamp knew more about history and facts than a loyal scholar like Fr. Thurston; Tyrrell certainly knew otherwise in his lucid moments—"However much researches like yours would be according to my taste, I am afraid they are out of my power".

It is unpleasant to see a priest write in the unfilial and doctrinally uncritical tone of *Fact and Fiat*, passing over the deficiencies of the Modernists' scholarship, implying that they had unearthed a mass of vital facts which the Church could not countenance, when, in fact, their ideas were mainly ill-founded and ephemeral, taking Dr. Alec Vidler rather than the Pope for mentor, disparaging *Rerum Novarum*, crediting Mother Church—*his* Mother, too—with the "consecration of ignorance", holding silence in regard to the modernists' own confessions ("It is the whole value of revelation which is at stake," said Tyrrell), being rude to Cardinal Bourne and Bishop Amigo, indulging in a quick kick at Newman, unfairly accusing Cardinal Mercier of cowardice, and sneering at the canonization of Pius X

as "surely the most improbable event in curial history since the election of Pope John". It is tragic that a priest should dishonour his Mother, and incredible that it should not have dawned on him what the struggle against modernism was about. Obviously the Church is not perfect, and it is true that fanatics appeared on the anti-Modernist side, so that Cardinal Mercier, the challenger of Modernism, remarked to Wilfrid Ward, "We need a campaign against the anti-Modernists", but Modernism was an attack on *truth*.

Dr. Hans Kung, in *The Theologian and the Church*, speaks of Protestant "‘doctrinal chaos’, as it has been called even on the Protestant side", and in *The Living Church* he refers to the "devastating chaos in preaching and doctrine" and "progressive fragmentation" of Protestantism. *That* is the fate from which Pius X, under God, saved the Catholic Church. Unless my memory is at fault, Dr. Mascall has admitted that the Church of England is comprehensive enough to include even atheists. If the Catholic Church has not mixed Catholicism and atheism, it was no thanks to the Modernists; Loisy held that the attribution of personality to God seemed anthropomorphism, while poor Tyrrell suffered underlying doubts as to the very existence of God. If it were possible for the Church to tolerate such a mixture, she would have reached the end of the Modernist line where van Buren preaches the secularisation of religion. As we leave the early Modernists, we may reflect on other words written by Dr. Mascall: "the phrase 'the assured results of modern criticism' has become something of a joke in theological circles, even among those who show most assurance about their own results".

### *The Papacy Diminished*

Since an orthodox Catholic writes with positive intent, even when he must spend time in "negative" criticism, an early chapter of my book is spent on *The Teaching Authority*, and is of necessity concentrated on papal teaching authority, since this is the rock which holds the Church



firm. The Modernist pretends—for example, Fr. Richard P. O'Brien in *Do We Need the Church?*—that our attitudes to the papacy have been formed only in the context of the birth-control issue, that “both extremes” have been hypnotised by Vatican I which made the Pope a “super-theologian”. This is falsehood, since an orthodox Catholic is the inheritor of the views of great saints such as Irenaeus, Ambrose, Basil, Jerome, John Chrysostom, Augustine, Peter Chrysologus, Bernard, Anselm, Aquinas, Fisher and Moore. And loyal Catholics *applied* traditional belief in 1968.

In fact, Fr. O'Brien and others have missed the reality and stood truth upon its head. The paradox is that, while the moderate canons of Vatican I, which so disappointed the hopes of the wilder men, seemed *at the time* to result in greater prestige for the papacy, *the long-term result is that the Christ-given authority of the papacy has been in practice diminished*. People have been so hypnotised by infallibility, which is rarely called into play, that they have half-forgotten true papal authority which is exercised year after year. That is why it is vital to read what was taught by saints and doctors who had never known a technically infallible decree; that is how we learn the nature of papal authority and what duty of submission is involved . . . if one is a Catholic. And, having learned, there is then a point in quoting *Mysterium Fidei*, *Mystici Corporis* or *Humanae Vitae*. Until then, one might as well quote Bishop Robinson instead, as Peter de Rosa did.

### *The Real Presence*

St. Catherine of Siena once said, “Do not be proud. It will coarsen your understanding”. One is reminded of the words when one reads what the “ablest minds” in Holland have been doing to the doctrine of the Blessed Sacrament. Quite simply, they have emptied the tabernacle and killed the mystery, and Luther would not have touched their sophisms with a Rhine barge-pole. Their fallacies are so pathetic that one wonders how grown men could tolerate

them for a second. Charles Davis pointed to the explanation when he said: "Because of their paradoxical position, people who hold more or less the same views as I do and yet remain within the Church seem to suffer distorting effects on their thinking. I get the impression at times of a tension, a forced carelessness, an uneasy subtlety or ingenuity in arguing". Yet priests in this country have been conned; as once before, the Dutch are sweeping up the Channel. There are young priests in my own diocese who do not believe that the material substances of bread and wine are changed into the material substance of our Lord's body and blood (they say so frankly); but they see no reason why they should cease saying Mass or should leave the Church. They hold (they say) only a new interpretation in the light of . . . etc. It would be consoling to think that they were freak mutations without fellows, but writings in England (even catechetical handouts) show that they are not. Therefore, immediately after writing on *The Teaching Authority*, I have turned to this key belief of Catholics and shown, I hope, the Double-Dutch idiocy of transignification. *Ave verum corpus!*

### *Et Cetera*

Chapters follow on *Humanae Vitae* (including the tragic failure of the English hierarchy in 1968), *Newman and Conscience* (the exact opposite of the Cardinal's teaching was preached in 1968 so that progressive Catholics could champion conscience against authority), *The Antinomians* (who will not tolerate hard and fast laws of any kind—even, pardon the blasphemy, God's kind; but propose soft, loose ones, if any), the Scriptures (*Campfire Stories & Historical Fiction?*), *Original Sin*, *Christ's Knowledge — Christ the Light of the World or Christ in the Dark?* And there is a short chapter, *In Other Words*, dealing with attempts to bottle lovely old doctrinal wine in extraordinary modern skins. This last ties up with the whole question of doctrinal reinterpretation (or substitution) and deals with the department where angels fear to tread. Fr. Avery Dulles, for

example, attempting for some unsatisfactory reason to re-express the doctrine of the Trinity, appears to have resurrected the Sabellian heresy. And here is Fr. George H. Tavard, in *Paul Tillich and the Christian Message*, suggesting that an orthodox Christology might be worked out along Tillich's lines and having a brave bash: "What the Council of Chalcedon, using a Greek vocabulary, called the two natures, divine and human of Christ, we should call the two humanities of Jesus: the divine Humanity, which is God himself, the eternal Exemplar of all images of God; and the creaturely humanity, in whose shape the divine Humanity appeared on earth . . . These two are one . . . In order to avoid Nestorian implications, we should not speak of Jesus as two men, but as two humanities . . . This could conceivably open the door to a solution of the ever-recurrent problem of the knowledge of Christ.

Thank God, one reflects, that the vocabulary used by Chalcedon passed latinised into our language so that Chalcedon makes sense to us. I have no fear that Fr. Tavard's re-expression will be condemned, since I do not see any real meaning. The complaint that I would lodge concerns the sterility of such leaden attempts to refresh the Christian palate; at the best, they confuse and obscure. Modernism, said Archbishop Goodier, was a "juggling with words". It continues, with a background of the philosophy of phenomenology to make confusion worse confounded. I would make every seminarian today learn one anecdote about Lincoln. "If you call a tail a leg", he asked, "how many legs has a dog?" He was told *five*. "No," he said, "*four*. You can call a tail anything you like, but it will still be a tail". Dutch-style theologians, please copy.\*

---

\*The *Enemy within the Gate* will be available from, at least, the staunchly Catholic Booksellers, A. Harkins & Bros., 4-6 North Bank Publications; also Pro Fide Book Service, 39, Blenheim Park Road, Croydon, Surrey.



Here is an account by a member of his audience of a lecture given by Father Gregory Baum on April 23rd of this year to a gathering at the London University Chaplaincy. Last April/May Father Baum spoke at half-a-dozen chaplaincies. We have no reason to believe that the substance or tone of his address on any of these occasions differed from that given below. What we have below is an account rendered by one of themselves of the neo-Modernist conspiracy within the Church. Clearly, it causes Baum great satisfaction. It causes us none. Why was this man ever allowed to come here to spread his heretical poison? Those who invited him and those who permitted the invitation have much to answer for.

## Dr. Baum Comes to Town

DAVID BOYCE

ON 23rd April the Rev. Gregory Baum addressed a gathering of the Newman Society held at the London University Chaplaincy on the subject of "The Church of the Future". The audience comprised students young and old, several young priests fresh from seminary training and a considerable number of religious sisters. The attraction no doubt for the priests and nuns lay in the fact that the Rev. Baum was a peritus at the Second Vatican Council and, far from being eccentric, he was right there at the heart of things; where the action was, when it really mattered. He is rightly considered to be "in the know" and is looked upon as an authoritative interpreter of the Second Vatican Council. It is important to bear this in mind when considering his statements.

Catholics who are pained by Baum's vision of the Church as a mere humanizing factor in society, with the priest as no more than a Jane-Austen-type clergyman without his manners, cannot hope to discount Baum as an outsider. He enjoys the confidence of ecclesiastical authority and is now a professor of theology at Toronto in Canada where he lectures to an ecumenical audience of aspirants to the ministry—Catholics, Anglicans and Protestants alike. How many traditionalist Catholic clergy can claim as much? We have to face the fact that Baum and his friends are at the hub, while we who profess our orthodoxy are being pushed further and further out on a limb.

Professor Baum developed his theme of "The Church of the Future" by examining three main trends that have emerged in Church life as a result of the Second Vatican Council. The three trends are Collegiality, Solidarity and Humanisation.

### *Baum and Collegiality*

Collegiality, according to Baum, is democracy. It means that the Pope is no longer monarch; he is constrained to act in consultation with national churches before making any decision. The bishop is no longer ruler in his diocese; he must turn to advisers and commissions before every move. The parish priest is no longer in charge of his cure, but must depend on elected councillors for their advice. Collegiality was the main achievement of Vatican II because it effectively deprived the Catholic Church of an authoritative voice. The Council documents have established collegiality as the sheet anchor of the post-conciliar Church and, if any bishop should dare to forget it and behave as a shepherd to his flock, then he is to be confronted with the documents which he signed along with the world's episcopate; but which were written, says, Baum, by him, the peritus, and his colleagues. Having inveigled the bishops into signing documents, the consequences of which they could scarcely have guessed, he adds insult to injury by dismissing them

all as mediocrities and likely to remain so until the end of time.

English bishops, incidentally, might be interested to learn from Baum why they are dragging their feet over ecumenism. The reason is that if the Established Anglican Church were recognized by Rome as a sister church that would result in the Anglican Church being the Catholic Church in England, what then would become of the Roman Catholics, who would be a sort of rump, and their bishops, who would be left with no position at all? Baum confesses that he himself would be worried if he were an English R.C. bishop. They could not even be social animators; there would be hardly any society left for them to animate.

### *Baum and Solidarity*

Secondly, solidarity is the means by which the Church is dissolved in the world. The Servant Church is the dissolving church in which the world's aims and material progress become ours and are eventually indistinguishable from the world. Catholics must not look upon their own Church as the source of truth; in their search for truth they must cooperate with other denominations, other religions and with Marxists. Together they will express their concern for the world. It was because the Roman Mass was indifferent to the world and offered no prayer for the world that it had to be rewritten in order to make way for a liturgical expression of our concern for the "world".

Baum sees great scope for the Catholic Church in this enterprise for, more than any other Christian body, we have a greater proportion of the deprived and the oppressed, especially in Latin America. It is there that the Church's identification with Marxism will be put into effect and where the Church's traditional alignment with conservative-type governments will be laid to rest forever. The Church's new alignment is already visible on the streets of New York. There was a time when the New York policeman was polite



to any priest or nun; the New York cop now knows that there are priests and priests, nuns and nuns. The Church's destiny lies with the ongoing revolution. The missionaries, whose patron is St. Therese of Lisieux, are condemned by Baum as worldly along with St. Therese herself. Worldly!? Yes, they wanted to conquer the world for Christ, whereas the good post-conciliar missionary lets the world develop according to its own desires and is neither dominating nor imposing. God hates domination, says Baum, more than anything else, and St. Therese of Lisieux was guilty of it. She was a colonialist and an aggressionist and in her letters to missionaries thought only of the glory of France. So much for the saint who has been the inspiration of countless religious vocations.

### *Baum and Humanisation*

Thirdly, humanisation. The Church's mission, says Baum, will be to make us more human. Baum doubts whether we are yet fully human, maybe we are the "missing link". We must be freed in order to express our humanity to the full. At the moment, we are clamped down by restrictions and the Church, once so oppressive in regulating human relations, will now open out to foster the joy of intimate personal relations indiscriminately. Baum did not spell out the consequences of this universal "*épanouissement*", but, given our fallen nature, doubtless Mrs. Castle's generous provision of free contraceptives to all and sundry from the age of puberty onwards is the upshot of all that. The Fall is not part of Baum's vocabulary. When things go wrong it is because we are not yet fully human and the answer is evolution not redemption. Personal fulfilment here on earth, "The Kingdom come on earth", we were told, is the goal of life. Life after death is a sheer distortion of the Gospel. Heaven is simply symbolic of the humanised material world. So. St. Therese who truly understood the meaning of "Thy Kingdom come on earth as it is in Heaven" is worldly, while those who aim to make a heaven of this world, what are they?

## *Two Churches*

Baum is aware that Catholics are not going to swallow this "theology" over night, so, for the time being, there exist two churches; the church of the parishes where priest and people often contrive to live as if nothing very serious had happened as a result of Vatican II; and the Church of the colleges and educational institutes where "we" operate. Those who find the parish insufficiently open and human gravitate towards "us" where there is free liturgy and sympathetic group-feeling. Generally the two "churches" never meet and are fairly ignorant of each others' activities. However, there have to be occasional meetings in order to transplant the wisdom of the future into the parishes. Some religious sisters and school teachers have to be drawn into the college system where they learn "our" ideas in order to take them back into the schools where conflict can be expected from conservative parents. There may be some doubts about the humanity of such parents, but the humanised sisters will do their best for the children; this was the impression I got.

## *Questions and Answers*

The questions and answers I heard cast further light on this vision of the future Church. I myself asked Baum whether it would be correct to conclude from his talk that the Church of the future would no longer be an identifiable body, but simply a movement for the spiritual animation of universal democracy. Baum was delighted and found the term an almost exact definition of what he had been talking about, except that he would leave out the word "spiritual" and broaden the concept out to make the Church quite simply a movement for humanisation and nothing more.

The speaker was asked whether it was not now time to erase the word "infallibility" from our vocabulary. In reply, a word of caution from Baum; of course we don't believe in infallibility as a rational concept, but we want to hold on

to the word. Kung made a mistake in attacking infallibility. By attacking infallibility, Kung hands the term over to the exclusive use of the conservatives. We don't want that; we need to keep the term "infallibility" for ourselves; it is very useful.

A non-Christian was curious to know how Baum's vision of the Church, as it must become, can be realized without open conflict. After all, the Pope is still there in Rome, the bishops still appear to be ruling their dioceses, and the parish priests still seem to be masters in their parishes. When and how is it all going to end? Baum is confident that conflict can be avoided. Max Weber is our guide for bringing about social change. Leave the task to those whom Weber calls "charismatic" or critical people; those who have a nose for the peoples' unconscious grievances, and know how to verbalize them. In other words, once the slogans are coined, they will be chanted by everyone everywhere. A little militancy however is advisable for the sake of symbolic visibility. A group of twelve persons is enough to form a front with a name like "Catholics for Social Change". The name gets known, you appear on television, get reported in the newspapers and make the occasional court appearance in a squatters' case for example. For the rest, leave it to the patient network—a little group here, a small publication there—that is how to get Vatican II finally implemented.

### *Conclusions*

What conclusions do we draw from Professor Baum's talk? Firstly and immediately, an appeal to our religious sisters. The subversion of the Church cannot fully succeed without the co-operation of the nuns. I make no apology for the word subversion for that is so obviously the explanation for the Church's unparalleled crisis. This state of affairs did not just happen by evolution; it was made to happen. Professor Baum himself has told us that the "church" he represents and the Church of the parishes have to meet occasionally in order that he and his friends may inseminate

the wisdom of the future. The inseminators are sisters and Catholic teachers chosen to go on courses under the tutelage of Baum and his friends. The teachers so indoctrinated and especially the sisters, whose habit of religious obedience is ruthlessly exploited, are sent back to the schools where they are being used to corrupt the faith of our children. Sisters, do not lend yourselves to be instruments of subversion, particularly where Christ's little ones are concerned. As parents, we beg you to remain faithful to your religious vocations.

The sisters have been exposed to terrible pressures. They are fed with nonsense about having second class status in the Church, and urged to throw off their modesty and submissiveness in order to assert their "equality", whereas the truth is that the sisters are vital and their role in the Church incalculable. The enemy knows this better than the sisters themselves, hence the drive to capture the nuns' dedication and direct it into other channels, no longer to water the Church but to undermine it.

Secondly and more long-sightedly, traditionalist Catholics need to reconsider their attitude towards the Second Vatican Council. Hitherto, many of us have taken the Council as a yard-stick by which to judge developments in the Church over the last ten years. We now know that this same yard-stick is being used by the Church's enemies as a rod for our backs. The Second Vatican Council was by definition not doctrinal but purely pastoral, and this was so arranged by the very people who would now love dearly to see the Council decrees elevated to doctrinal status. Remember that Baum does not want to give up "infallibility". It is too useful a stick with which to beat the likes of us into submission.



# Readings at Mass

FRANCIS FENN, S.J.

**L**UKE 10.1 (July 7) is an interesting example of two different renderings of a scriptural text which have equal merit. The evidence of ancient manuscripts of the Gospel for "seventy" (RSV) is about the same as that for "seventy-two" (JB). No reason can be given for the difference; nor does it greatly matter.

The instructions given to the 70 (or 72)—of whom this is the only mention—are very similar to those given to the Twelve (9,1-6). The wording in our passage "carry no purse, no haversack (bag), no sandals" is applied at the Last Supper to the Twelve (22,35). The next words, "Salute no one on the road" are not an instruction to be rude, but an indication of the urgency of the task of the disciples—they are not to linger around (cf. 2 Kings 4,29). They *are* to greet people in the houses they visit. "~~Son~~ of peace" is probably better than "man of peace" (JB)—the idea being that the peace possessed and offered by the messengers of Christ begets peace in those willing to receive it. The saying "the labourer deserves his wages" is quoted in I Timothy 5,18 as "scripture" (see also I Cor 9,14). Jewish dietary laws, it will be noticed, no longer have any force. The whole passage reflects the situation in the early Church when bands of missionaries, larger than the Twelve, were sent out to preach the gospel of peace.

My commentary points out that the next two readings (10,25-42) form a structured whole: (a) the word of God about charity, (b) the story of the good Samaritan, (b) Martha's neighbourly concern—"distracted with serving" because Jesus (as at Cana) probably brought several people with him, (a) the word of Jesus about "the one thing needful" (cf. 4,4; 8,21). One gets the impression that Martha's good intention (of single-minded service) did not

quite last out—for want of however brief a pause for communion with God. In John 12,2 she is again found serving; and read John 11,20-27. She is counted as a saint by the Catholic Church.

Our Lord's instruction on prayer (July 28) follows quite naturally. Luke's version of the Lord's Prayer differs so much from that of Matthew that it must represent a different liturgical tradition. Luke's opening resembles early Christian prayer (Gal. 4,6; cf. Mark 14,36), whereas Matthew's (the one we use) is closer to the form of Jewish prayers. At the end of this very striking reading, where Matthew has "good things" (7,11), Luke speaks of the Gift *par excellence* of the Holy Spirit who enables us to share in the sonship of Jesus (Romans 8,23): Luke has often been called the evangelist of the Holy Spirit.

The second reading for July 7 contains the words "I bear on my body the marks of Jesus". The Greek word *stigmata* did not mean what it means to us today. Often it designated the branding which marked a slave (or animal) as someone's possession. Paul had suffered so much from stoning, floggings and other maltreatment in the cause of the Gospel that he could boast of the marks in his flesh that showed him to be the "slave of Christ" (Gal. 1,10; Rom. 1,1: in both cases RSV gives *slave* as a variant reading for *servant*). The Judaizers against whom he is writing wanted to boast of a different "mark in the flesh"—that of circumcision.

There follow four readings from Paul's letter to the church at Colossae, a city in Asia Minor 110 miles to the east of Ephesus. The founder of this community was Epaphras (1,7), a Colossian who had perhaps been converted by St. Paul during his stay in Ephesus. At the time he wrote this letter, Paul was in prison (4,3 & 18)—in Rome, according to tradition; though 4,7-9 suggests somewhere nearer, and there are hints elsewhere in Paul's letters that he had been in prison at Ephesus.

The error against which the letter was directed was a belief in "elements of the universe"—angelic beings who

were thought to hold the universe under their control. There was concern to have knowledge of these intermediaries between God and mankind and (a thoroughly pagan idea) to propitiate them by various outward practices, some of which were of Jewish origin. All this was in effect a denial of the unique position of Christ, which Paul proclaims in the reading on July 14.

One notes how Paul uses words (such as *mystery* and *wisdom*) which were current among those who held these erroneous beliefs, but applies them to God's plan of salvation in Christ. This was not a "secret" reserved for privileged initiates, but a revelation set forth for all mankind (July 21). The last of the four readings ("let your thoughts be on heavenly things, not on the things that are on the earth") is better understood if we bear in mind that Paul has just been speaking (2,20-23) of "earthly" religious practices which, since the death of Christ (and our sharing in this death) have no longer any meaning. There is only Christ now, and he is everything.

The Gospel themes on July 21 and 28 are well illustrated by the first readings from Genesis 18. The writer at once identifies Abraham's principal visitor for the reader's benefit. This is the one addressed "my lord"—though such form of address and Abraham's obeisance could be no more than part of oriental hospitality (Hebrews 13,2). In the second reading the two men (19,1 speaks of them as two angels) go on towards Sodom, "while Abraham remained standing before the Lord". God's answer to his prayer establishes the important principle that for the sake of the few God will avert retribution even from the wicked. The just man is truly the life of the community.

---

Note. For the benefit of new subscribers, JB means Jerusalem Bible and RSV Revised Standard Version (Catholic edition).

John Eppstein has recently had published an important book entitled "The Catholic Church and the Cult of Revolution". Published in the United States by Arlington House it is available in this country. This review article is written in support of Mr. Eppstein's thesis. His book is warmly commended to readers of *Christian Order*.

## CURRENT COMMENT

# The Church and Revolution

*1: In Denial of Catholic Teaching*

THE EDITOR

THE opening sentence of this important book is stunning in its impact, at least for those possessed of more than a notional understanding of the meaning of revolution and the violence, which is its invariable concomitant. "For the first time in the history of Christian civilization", writes John Eppstein, "revolution is being presented today as an essential, if not the essential aspect of the social mission of Christianity". As from now, according to this thesis, the knife and the bomb are legitimate and, indeed, essential instruments in the hands of militant Christians. The proposition stuns because so completely at variance not only with the teaching of Christ Our Lord and his Apostles, but with that of the Church He founded, from earliest times until the present day. Yet the revolutionary thesis continues to be presented with confidence within the Church and, indeed, without it by other Christian bodies. John Eppstein continues on his opening page: "Marxist priests, propelled as they imagine by the wind of history and seeking to reconcile



remnants of their religion with a social dogma which knows no God, are not alone in this pretension. There are other theologians, Protestant and Catholic, busily engaged in justifying the thesis that violence is a necessary means of social progress and reform". There is within the Church now a growing literature which would commit Catholics to revolutionary action as an ineluctable necessity. It is against one of the leading protagonists of this thesis—the Belgian Abbé Comblin in his *Theologie de la Revolution*—that Eppstein's book, *The Cult of Revolution within the Church* (1) is mainly directed. I would take this opportunity of recommending it to readers of *Christian Order* very warmly indeed.

### *Ongoing Revolution*

Mr. Eppstein has little difficulty in showing that the revolutionary thesis, as put forward now by progressive writers within the Church, is forced; there is no warranty for it in the New Testament or in the teaching of the Church from earliest times until the present day. The burden of proof is on those who deny this, asserting that Christianity of its very nature is committed to what is best called ongoing revolution. At this point it is important to be very clear. Support for *particular* revolution by way of last resort against a *particular* tyranny is found in the writings of Catholic moralists and popes from St. Thomas Aquinas through Leo XIII and Pius XI to our present Holy Father, Paul VI. But we are not concerned here with *particular* revolution, neither are the Abbé Joseph Comblin and his supporters. Their concern is with *ongoing* revolution, which would commit Christians, if they are to be worthy of their vocation, to constant confrontation and revolutionary violence against what they think of as the

---

(1) Published by Arlington House Publishers, New Rochelle, N.Y., U.S.A. at \$6.95: London agent,, Fransatleatic Book Services Ltd., 51, Weymouth St., London, S.W.1.

existing evil establishment of contemporary capitalism/colonialism, open or disguised in neo-colonialist form. This, for Comblin and his supporters, is the enemy; it is against this apparatus and its inherently "violent" structure that Christians are called to wage revolutionary war in any and all of its varied forms. This is what "revolution" means in the context of this article; not a particular revolt, but ongoing violent confrontation against what are thought of as the evil (because oppressive) structures of an existing, established order of society.

### *Christ's Message is Personal*

There are several lines open in repudiation of the thesis of ongoing revolution. Amongst them is that which rightly lays emphasis on the fact that the message of Christ Our Lord in the Gospels is essentially personal; it is directed not to the mass of men, but to each one's individual soul; the call of Christ is not to revolutionary uprising, but to the spiritual combat which each must wage within himself if he is to attain the newness of life, which means the Grace of God in his soul, and, with it, the promise of personal salvation. What the Christian looks forward to because of Christ's Redemption is not liberation through revolutionary violence from the oppression of unjust socio/political structures, but "the blessed hope and coming of the glory of the Great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ" (Titus 2/13). It is, of course, quite true that those who live in this hope because united in Christ by Grace, will bring by way of by-product to the society of which they form a part a measure of justice and peace. No one will deny this. What is denied is that the core of Christ's call was for collective revolutionary action in aid of a temporal paradise; that the newness of life He promised is validly interpreted in terms of an earthly Utopia. Those who hold to this thesis make, as Eppstein says so well, "a sorry caricature of the one true religion" and nonsense of the whole course of history.

## *His Call is to Spiritual Combat*

Confirmation of what has just been said is provided by Christ Himself from the first instant of His public life. It is essentially to a spiritual not a socio-political struggle that Christ summons men, something that goes on inside a man and that is independent, in essence, of social and political structures. All four Evangelists begin their story of Our Lord's public life with an account of the preaching of John the Baptist. Mark takes us to it abruptly, almost tersely, at the very outset of his Gospel: "... so it was that John the Baptist appeared in the wilderness, proclaiming a baptism of repentance for the forgiveness of sin". The tone is indicated straightaway, the scene is set in the wilderness where man can wait on God in silence and listen whilst God speaks in the depths of his soul. There, the Baptist calls on his hearers to take count of their sins within themselves, confess them and be baptised in token of repentance. The whole setting is that of inner, spiritual combat; not social revolution from without, but repentance from within. And it is within this context of spiritual struggle, with its call to repentance, that Christ makes the first appearance of his public life—to be baptised Himself by John, then, at once, proclaimed, miraculously and mystically, by God the Father as his beloved Son and favoured One, whilst the Spirit of God came down on Him.

The message here is clear, given by Him, who was proclaimed Son and favoured One of God at the outset of his public life and in the wake of his own personal endorsement of the Baptist's call to repentance. It is to spiritual and interior combat that Christ calls men at the very outset of his public life; in no way to that which is political and social, concerned with seeming structures of oppression. And, as if to make his message still more clear to the men of his time and ours, Christ is driven—impelled, urged, nudged, if you like—by the Spirit on into the wilderness; there to spend forty days in prayer and fasting, whilst locked in combat with, tempted by the Devil. And, as it

was at the outset, so it is through the whole of Our Lord's public life. He makes abundantly clear in the Gospels that it is from the slavery of sin that he has come to deliver men. Again and again He shows his followers by word and deed that they can take heart and co-operate confidently with Him in the work of their salvation precisely because He Himself has complete and absolute power over Satan, his fellow devils and all the powers of darkness. There is no question here of mistaken identity; of the Devil projected by a primitive mind as a substitute for events in fact produced by tribal superstition, cultural clash, witchcraft or any of the other old favourites the demythologizers are so fond of putting before us. No; emphasis throughout the Gospels is on the total power of Christ over a totally real Satan and his totally real devils, so that men, united with Him, may engage with complete confidence in the *personal* struggle that must be theirs against the powers of darkness. This lesson is taught again and again in the Gospels. Its message is clear; that Christ's liberation is not primarily from oppressive material conditions, but from sin and the Devil, who tempts us to sin. The kingdom to be gained was within each one's self. This is what Our Lord taught his followers throughout his public life. His kingdom was not of this earth, as he told Pilate at the crisis point of his life, and the power that was so manifestly his was never used to divert men from the interior, spiritual life and combat He kept on telling them was manifestly theirs, but only to draw them towards it. If he could have had from his Father a legion of angels to deliver Him from the horrors of his Passion, He could have had legions more to establish justice on earth or wage revolutionary war against existing oppressive structures, had the doing of either been his primary intention in coming amongst men. But it was not. His kingdom was an affair of the heart. He did not become man to present humanity with a bill of rights or carve out for them an earthly kingdom, but, as the Catechism puts it so well, "to save them from sin and Hell and to show them the way to Heaven".



The conclusion that flows even from this cursory survey is, I think, inescapable. It is that Christ Our Lord was not essentially concerned, during his time on this earth, with ongoing revolution or, even, the reform of the social order in the interests of social justice. His was not a temporal kingdom. It was to inner, spiritual combat that He called first and foremost. The deliverance He brought was not from the slavery of oppressive structures, but from that of Satan through sin. This is what he came to do. This is what his Redemption meant. This is why He founded his Church—to extend through time and to all men the fruits of his redeeming work. Its primary task is there; its first concern not revolution, not confrontation with any existing social or political order, not social justice, not, even, the material uplift of the poor, but—simply and magnificently—the salvation of mankind.

### *Newness of Life*

This, of course, is what the newness of life promised by Christ in the Gospels meant and always will mean; not a bright earthly future for all won by revolutionary clerics at the point of a gun, but brotherhood in Christ shared by all to whom Baptism has brought the new life of Grace won for all men by Christ in his Redemption. It is the task of each so favoured, whatever his state or calling, to co-operate with the Grace that is his, walking with Christ through this earthly life so that, at death, that which was begun in Baptism may find with Christ in Heaven full and final consummation. This is the task of the Christian. He will achieve it only to the extent that here on earth, with the help of God, he makes Heaven lie about him, as he makes his way forward through life. What counts, at base, is not his condition, but his concern that whatever he has (or has not) should be in his own eyes as nothing compared with the promise of eternal life, which is his through Baptism in Christ Jesus his Lord. This is what is meant by the poverty of spirit that Christ in the Gospels enjoined on

his followers. The question is not one of material poverty. The model for the Christian is not the beggar. It is the "poor man of Yahweh" of the Psalms (33/7) and Isaiah (6/1 — 2); the man, that is, who humbly acknowledges that in all truth he is nothing in face of his Creator, but "who cries out to Yahweh with complete confidence to be delivered from all distress and every need, who looks to Yahweh for everything and attributes everything to Him, even the material prosperity that may be his". (2)

### *Poverty of Spirit*

Christ's call in the Gospels, then, is not that all should be materially poor or that those who were materially poor should be his followers' first concern. His call was that all, whether rich or poor, should become *poor in spirit*; that is, reckoning all they had or had not as nothing in comparison with the gift of new life that was their's through Baptism in Christ Jesus their Lord. Christ was no egalitarian revolutionary, working on the envy of a ragged following and calling on its members to overthrow an establishment deemed unjust in their eyes because the wealth of its richer members suited their desires. The poverty Christ preached was of the spirit in the sense described above; not that of Judas who understood nothing of Our Lord's message in this regard and who was scandalized, in consequence, because Mary Magdalen's ointment of great price was used to anoint Christ's feet and not sold, as he advocated, and the proceeds given to the poor. Too many clerical revolutionaries in the Church today are, I am afraid, no more than Iscariots in this regard, masking, under their call for social justice and revolution what is, in fact, no more than an envious egalitarianism whose roots are found not in the charity of Christ, but in the coarse categories of the class war.

John Eppstein, in his book, lays courageous emphasis

---

(2) M. Dehlin in *Permanences*, early 1972.

on the point just made when he shows that, far from calling on the slaves, the poor and the dispossessed of their day to rise in revolt against their masters, the Apostles commanded them to obey those in authority over them. Faithful to their Master, Jesus Christ, the first concern of the Apostles was with poverty of spirit, irrespective of the material condition of those to whom they preached. It was true, of course, that the practice of poverty of spirit, as an expression of the spiritual, inner struggle to which every Christian was called, would spill over into the temporal sphere and do much to relieve material poverty itself; but this could not be sought for its own sake, for that kind of horizontalism, then as now, could only end up in humanism; what Mother Theresa has defined so rightly as social work without God. Lawful authority, then, had to be obeyed, even though pagan and, indeed, oppressive, for what counted first for Saints Peter and Paul was that men, whatever their material situation, should have their eyes on Heaven; an ongoing revolt of Rome's slaves held no priority so far as they were concerned.

### *Peter and Paul and Obedience to Authority*

Here, then, is St. Peter in the second chapter of his first epistle:

Be ye subject to every human creature for God's sake: whether it be to the king as excelling, or to governors as sent by him for the punishment of evil-doers and for the praise of the good. For so is the will of God, that by doing well you may put to silence the ignorance of foolish men; as free and not making liberty a cloak for malice, but as the servants of God. Honour all men, love the brotherhood, fear God, honour the king (1 Peter 11;13-17).

St. Paul is no less forthright in what he has to say to the Romans:

Let every soul be subject to higher powers. For there is no power but from God. Therefore he that resisteth the power resisteth the ordinance of God. And they that resist purchase to themselves damnation (Romans XIII:1-7).

As John Eppstein drily remarks, this is hardly an incitement to on-going revolution. St. Paul continues:

Wherefore be subject of necessity; not only for wrath but also for conscience sake. For therefore also you pay tribute. For they are the ministers of God serving unto this purpose. Render therefore to all men their dues; tribute to whom tribute is due; custom to whom custom; fear to whom fear; honour to whom honour (Romans XIII:1-7).

Both Apostles are equally plain-spoken in the instructions they give to the servants and slaves of their day. Here is St. Peter:

Servants be subject to your masters with all care, not only to the good, but also to the forward. For this is thankworthy: if for conscience towards God, a man endures sorrows, suffering wrongfully. For what glory is it if, committing sin and being buffeted for it you endure? But if doing well you suffer patiently, this is thankworthy before God (1 Peter 11;18,19).

And here is St. Paul:

Servants be obedient to your masters according to the flesh (Ephesians VI;6,5)

Exhort servants to be obedient to their masters, in all things pleasing, not gainsaying, not defrauding, but in all things showing good fidelity that they may adorn the doctrine of God our Saviour in all things (Titus 11;9,10).



Whatever they may be—and whether you like them or not—these are not the words of ongoing revolutionaries. They are not spoken by men who see their primary task as Christians as that of leading the oppressed through violence into an egalitarian paradise. What they do signify is an attitude of mind and heart that reckons all as nothing in comparison with the gift of Christ to the soul. This is what we mean and this is what Christ meant by poverty of spirit. In their advocacy of it, the two great Apostles showed how well they understood the mind of their Master and their faithfulness to it. So far as they were concerned, the circumstances of a man's life were not of primary importance: what counted was where he was looking (at Heaven or earth), not what he was doing. A man's heart had to be where his treasure was and his treasure was Christ. It was this that counted. Provided Christ held a man's heart, the material circumstances of his life did not matter all that much, where the two Apostles were concerned. As they saw it, I think, the material circumstances of a man's life were matter for reform only to the extent that they affected the grip of Christ on his heart, as an excess of poverty or riches could easily do. Here, once again, the measuring-rod was poverty of spirit, the heavenly-mindedness which Christ Our Lord had enjoined on his followers. What these had to look for was not wealth or, indeed, poverty, or egalitarianism, or happiness, even, for its own sake; none of these, but, simply, as St. Paul wrote to Titus, “. . . the blessed hope and coming of the glory of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ (11;13). Once this outlook was theirs, the rest would follow. The political kingdom was not to come first. A man's riches were in himself, his happiness essentially a by-product of his basic outlook, something never to be sought for its own sake. Under such circumstances—those appropriate to Christianity as enjoined by its founder, Jesus Christ—there could be no greater absurdity than a revolutionary priest with a gun. The argument is incontrovertible.

## *Early Church in Support of Authority*

Eppstein is, perhaps, at his best in this book when he sketches out—with the ease that flows from complete command of his subject—how the Fathers of the Early Church—St. Clement of Rome, St. Justin, Tertullian and Origen—were emphatic in their loyalty to imperial authority in faithfulness to the teaching of the Apostles and their Master, Jesus Christ. How wrong, then, and how totally unhistorical is the Abbé Comblin when he writes on page 61 of his book: “To throw men formed in the Old Testament world into the midst of pagan society is to cause fermentation, shock and revolution. At the least, it means planting in the heart of the Roman world a principle of permanent confrontation”. John Eppstein has no difficulty in showing how completely wrong this is: “Never”, he writes, “did the Church support any revolt against the structure of the Roman Empire, even when the most abominable emperors like Nero reigned”. Was this because it was pusillanimous? Certainly not.

What the Early Church chose was a different way; that of permeating “the (imperial) system at every level, not excepting the legions”. So successful was it in this endeavour that out of it Christendom was born.

## *In Support of Dignity and Peace*

And Christendom itself was supported by a growing volume of teaching which, as John Eppstein has shown with great clarity not only in this book, but in an article in the May issue of *Christian Order*,<sup>(3)</sup> was and continues to be consecrated not to the support of ongoing revolution, but to the sanctity of human life and the upholding of human dignity wherever it is to be found. Some of the greatest names in the Church have contributed magnificently to this teaching. Latterly it has been overshadowed by revolu-

(3) “The Anti-Portuguese Campaign: A Critical Examination; *Christian Order*, May, 1974.

tionary clerics whose knowledge of the Christian tradition in these, as in so many other matters, appears to come close to zero. I am afraid Dom Helder Camara and others of episcopal rank have smirched a splendid heritage and caused what may well prove to be irreparable harm; for what they have done in these latter days is to indulge in the kind of talk which has given violence its head, toning down the one great restraining force, which used all its influence in days gone by to uphold the sanctity of human life and sustain true dignity amongst men; doing all it could, wherever and whenever it could, to promote peace amongst men. Now, in these latter days, it is thought of by many, who have seen clerical revolutionaries at work or read of their doings, as urging them on to violence and hatred; as a factor not for peace, but for the promotion of class war. Let John Eppstein have the last word:

“The great sin of the intellectuals who are now trying to prove the essentially revolutionary character of the Scriptures is therefore that they are removing the one great inhibition to this human instinct of violence which the spiritual force of Christianity and its ethical standards represent. That is the pastoral consequence of the ‘theology of revolution’.”

The consequence is not small. The Abbé Comblin and his followers have much to answer for. Readers are very strongly recommended to read John Eppstein's book.

---

### Please Note

*The Catholic Church and the Cult of Revolution* is obtainable from Pro Fide Book Service, 39 Blenheim Park Road, Croydon, Surrey at £3.20 a copy.

# The Principle of Subsidiarity

J. M. JACKSON

THE principle of subsidiarity has played an important part in the development of Catholic social teaching. It has, perhaps, been neglected in recent years. Indeed, the whole traditional social teaching of the Church has been overlooked by a large proportion of Catholics. Many have never even heard of it. It is a great pity that there is now no organisation devoted to the promotion of this teaching, and it is to be hoped that something may come in Scotland from the efforts that are being made by the Social and Economic Affairs Committee of the Lay Apostolate to have this teaching made an essential part of the school religious education syllabus. Others, of course, have decided for themselves that the great social encyclicals and the body of doctrine which has grown up around them are irrelevant to the problems of our day. In an admirable article in the March issue of *Christian Order*, Dr. Colin Clark re-stated many of the important principles of the Church's teaching on economic and social questions. In an important section on the individual and the State he stated that 'the next important principle is that the purpose of the State is to serve the individual, not the individual the State'.

It is, of course, possible to accept this proposition without accepting that this imposes, as Clark argues, severe restrictions on the proper role of the State. One may argue 'that government provision of education, health and other welfare services is more efficiently organised than private provision would be'. Is this, as Clark claims, 'naïve' or is it a justification for the extension of the role of the State? We may agree that bureaucracy is unlikely to provide the ideal service, but a brief sentence or two is not sufficient to

convince those who are already persuaded that the State **can** do better than any form of private provision. My purpose in this article is to see what State provision means in the case of one or two specific services and to see just where its weaknesses lie. Already in my article on the budget in June I argued that there were serious objections to the bread subsidy that the Government was introducing. Food subsidies conceal from the public the true cost of the food they are consuming, they are unnecessarily expensive in so far as they benefit all irrespective of need, and finally, in this particular instance, the subsidising of the standard white loaf denies benefit to those who choose to bake their own bread, to buy brown instead of white loaves and the pensioner who prefers the smaller loaf.

### *The Rights of the Individual*

The traditional teaching of the Church has been that individuals should be free to make the provision they wish for their own needs. The State should not take away from individuals or from voluntary organisations the right of making such provision unless the case for doing so is compelling. Moreover, the denial of the rights of the individual may be effective, even though there may be no embargo on individual provision. At the present time, a high level of taxation makes it possible for the Government to provide 'free' education and medical care. At the present time, individuals are, however, free to seek education and medical care outside the State system if they wish. Nevertheless, many Labour Party politicians are committed to the total abolition of the private sector in education, and there has also been a big demand within the party for the abolition of facilities for private patients in National Health Service hospitals.<sup>1</sup> What really matters, however, is that already it is

---

1. It is no use Labour Party members arguing that if people want private treatment they should look for it in hospitals or clinics in the private sector. One has to remember that by taking over virtually all hospital facilities in 1948, the Government ensured that there was virtually nowhere to go for private treatment except in the limited number of beds set aside for private patients in NHS hospitals.



virtually impossible for any except the rich to go to the private sector. Most people, who are already paying for the State services through taxation, are not in a position to pay twice if they do not like what the State is offering them.

The evidence for the extension of the role of the State is clear. If we take a single figure to illustrate what has been happening, the level of taxation (including rates levied by local authorities) has risen from under 9 per cent of the national product in 1900 to just under 45 per cent in 1969. This increase is reflected in corresponding increases in government expenditure. This increase has partly been in expenditure on goods and services. Much of this is justified and reflects changing needs in fields for which the government is properly responsible. Defence is relatively more costly than it was at the beginning of the century; so, with the rising crime rate, is the enforcement of law and order and the administration of justice. In addition, however, it reflects such developments as the National Health Service, an area brought almost completely within the public sector in 1948 and also an area where medical progress has meant a vast increase in expenditure anyway. In addition, social security programmes mean that large sums are raised from one group in taxation or National Insurance contributions and paid to others in need.<sup>2</sup>

Further sums are spent on subsidising a variety of products. Some subsidies may be justified. It may be reasonable for the Government to subsidise firms operating in areas of high unemployment in order to stimulate economic activity in these areas. (Though the need for such subsidies might be much less if it were not for the fact that continued expansion of industrial activity in the more prosperous areas is itself subsidised by the free provision of new schools, hospitals and cheap council housing in such areas.) Other subsidies are unjustified, as already indicated at the start of this article, or in the case of housing, where again the benefits may be given to only some of those in need.

---

2. Though perhaps in many cases that need could have been met by some kind of private insurance.

## *Subsidised Council Housing*

I will start the examination of special cases by looking at the inefficiencies and inequities that arise from the unduly large role played by the State in the field of housing. Many councils throughout Britain provide a very large part of the total stock of housing and of the new housing currently being built. As a result of subsidies from the central government and from the rates, these are let to tenants at rents a long way below the economic cost of providing the accommodation. Despite the fact that council housing is very heavily subsidised, council tenants and their supporters in the Labour Party maintain that they are not in fact so heavily subsidised as owner occupiers who receive generous tax allowances on mortgage interest. It is essential, therefore, that we begin by looking carefully at the facts of the situation.

We may assume that a comparable house is built for private sale and for council letting, at a cost of £5,000. The private buyer will probably start with a mortgage for a twenty year period, though recently rising interest charges have led to a subsequent lengthening of the repayment period rather than an increase in monthly repayments. A buyer who takes a twenty year mortgage at 10 per cent interest will need to pay back about £587 a year. A local authority would reckon to repay the loan it raises to finance house construction over a sixty year period, and this will necessitate a sum of about £507 a year being set aside to pay interest and repay the capital. But the council tenant is rarely required to pay anything like £507 a year for a house costing £5,000 to build. Even if there were no subsidy from the central government or the rates, the local authority would only be required to balance its housing revenue account.

We may, therefore, look at what a council would have to pay in order to keep its account balanced. It would, of course, have to add something to cover maintenance costs, but since the owner-occupier will also have to meet similar

costs we will ignore these and concentrate on interest and capital repayment. Suppose the Council has a stock of two houses, and that one was built a few years ago at a cost of £4,000 and that the other has just been completed at a cost of £5,000. Suppose too that on both occasions it borrowed at a 10 per cent rate of interest and is repaying over a sixty year period. We have seen that the latter will involve annual payments of £507. By simple proportion, the earlier house will require interest and capital repayments amounting to roughly £405. Thus the total payments being made by the Council come to £912. In practice, councils will charge the same rent for both houses, so that the rent that would be required to balance the housing account would be £466. On the other hand, a tenant who requires a council house is in fact adding £507, the costs incurred by the house currently completed to the council's cost. Thus a tenant allocated a house at a rent of £466 is being given accommodation at a rent that is £43 below the cost of providing it. The person who buys a house, on the other hand, will have to pay the full cost of current production, and old houses will rise in price to match the rising costs of current building.

But council rents are unlikely to be high enough even to balance the housing account. The rent might be £300 a year or even less. This would mean that the council tenant could be receiving a subsidy of £166 or £209 a year, depending on whether one calculated this on the rent that balanced the account or the true economic rent based on current building costs. The owner occupier with the ordinary reducing mortgage will receive tax relief on the interest he pays. In the first year, he pays £500 interest (at ten per cent) and at the current rate of tax of 30 per cent will have his tax bill reduced by £150. This, however, is only in the first year. As part of the mortgage is repaid, interest payments decline and more of his monthly payments go to repay the capital. In fact, on a £5,000 mortgage at 10 per cent, a person will pay roughly £6,750 in interest over the twenty years, and at current tax rates save a total of £2,025 in tax,

or just over £100 a year. Thus the gain to the typical mortgage holder is less than to the council tenant.<sup>3</sup>

If we consider the case of the owner-occupier who takes out an endowment policy to repay his mortgage the position is rather different. The policy matures after twenty years and is then used to pay off the mortgage. The mortgage under this scheme does not reduce during the twenty year period, so that, in the example we have been considering, the householder pays £500 a year interest throughout and therefore receives a tax relief of £150 a year for twenty years. Even so, this may well be less than the difference between what a council tenant is paying and the true economic rent. These calculations, of course, have been made on the assumption that the two houses cost the same, and that the owner-occupier has taken out a 100 per cent mortgage. Usually, however, the house buyer will have to pay a substantial deposit on the purchase, though many people may be able to get up to 95 per cent mortgages on newly built houses. To the extent that the buyer has to put down a deposit, the mortgage and therefore the interest and in turn the tax relief is reduced proportionately. In so far as some houses on which tax relief in respect of mortgage interest is given are dearer than council houses, the relative gain from tax relief is increased. Against this, however, one has to recognise that the typical owner occupier may receive a benefit during the twenty years it takes to pay for his house whereas a council tenant may live in subsidised accommodation for forty years or more. In this case, the council tenant receives over his lifetime a vastly greater subsidy.

It has also been suggested that the abolition some years ago of the Schedule A tax conferred a special favour on the owner-occupier. This was a tax on the benefit that the owner-occupier was supposed to receive from the ownership

---

3. This is not true for the person who is paying income tax at a rate substantially above the standard rate. There is indeed a sound case for not giving relief at these higher rates on the luxury homes of the very rich, costing perhaps as much as £50,000.

of his house: an income was imputed to him in so far as he was better off than if he had to pay rent for his accommodation. But if we accept this line of argument, we would tax the ownership of cars (as distinct from the general Road Fund licence) on the ground that the car owner derived an 'income' because he did not have to hire a car, or the ownership of washing machines because they saved laundry bills. The owner-occupier has to pay for his house. If after twenty years he is thereafter free of charges for accommodation, then why should he not enjoy the fruits of his past sacrifice? The tenant, whether in a council or privately rented house, may claim that he goes on and on paying rent, that he has paid for the house perhaps several times over but he still has to go on paying. We must, however, remember that the owner-occupier is allowed normally twenty years to pay for his house. We saw that this would mean, on a similar loan, additional payments of £80 a year in order to meet interest charges and repay the capital within the prescribed period. The council tenant is never paying even the interest charges that are necessitated by the provision of a house for him. The idea that anyone should be deemed to receive an income from his own use of an asset that he has purchased is sheer stupidity.

The position, then, is that the council tenant is very heavily subsidised, much more heavily than the typical owner-occupier. If council tenants were all poor, there would be little objection to this arrangement. What is so inequitable about the present system is that there is no guarantee that these people who are so heavily subsidised are in any greater need than the owner-occupiers who are providing a large part of the money for these housing subsidies. Often they are not. The owner-occupier struggling with a heavy mortgage at high interest rates is having to pay for the council tenant as well; whilst the heavy rates resulting from council subsidies is a burden for example on pensioners who own their own houses.

The system also makes it difficult for people to change jobs if this means moving to another area. If there is a



waiting list for council houses in the area a person wants to move to, he may be reluctant to give up a heavily subsidised tenancy for much more expensive accommodation.

### *Medical Care*

In fields where there is State provision, there is likely to be a serious restriction on freedom of choice. This is true in the case of housing. Councils are unlikely to offer the same variety of accommodation as the private sector, and tenants may be restricted in their freedom to make alterations. In the field of medical care, there may seem to be less scope for the exercise of choice. The patient is rarely in a position to exercise any real choice about the treatment he is to receive; he must rely upon the advice he is given. There may be scope for choice in non-essentials. A hospital patient might prefer a single room to a large public ward. There is the belief that at the present time individuals who are prepared to pay for private treatment can get quicker treatment, or can select the time for admission to hospital in non-urgent cases. Preferential treatment may arise now because the system of State care has created the two sectors; a system that had helped those in need to provide for the costs of medical care instead of providing 'free' care for all would not have given rise to this problem.

The National Health Service can, of course, allow a reasonably free choice of general practitioner. This is one of the fields where the system has fewest harmful effects. Mental illness, which may involve long periods of hospital treatment, may well be a field where State provision is necessary. In the case of acute hospital care, however, the present type of service is neither necessary nor desirable. It must be recognised that it will rarely be possible to allow competing hospitals to be established in an area. Such an arrangement would be inefficient and costly. Some central authority would have to remain responsible for the provision of hospital facilities. It would not be necessary, however, for such a hospital authority to employ all the staff that

was needed to provide care for the patients. They would employ domestic and nursing staff, and junior doctors and surgeons, but not the consultants who would have the ultimate responsibility for the care of patients.

In all except the more unusual specialities there would, in a large hospital, be several consultants, and the system should allow a patient to be referred to the consultant of his choice (though obviously in most cases this choice would have to be made in the light of advice given by his general practitioner). The system could be devised so that any suitably qualified physician or surgeon in the area would have access to beds in the hospital. In this context, qualification would imply the possession of the relevant higher degree and a specified period of experience in various posts at junior level. There would not be a limited number of posts at consultant level which would be filled by the authority after advertisement, though some arrangement might be necessary to prevent too many practitioners in a particular field going to one part of the country and leaving other areas inadequately served.

There is one field in which this kind of system would be particularly valuable. There is at the present time an increasing demand that abortion facilities should be readily available within the National Health Service. If this is to be so, it follows that, despite the conscience clause, it must be possible to ensure that when obstetricians and gynaecologists are appointed it may be necessary to ensure that the appointee is willing to undertake this work. This is not the place to argue the case against abortion. It is the place to argue the case for preserving the rights of those women who may not want to resort to abortion and who are fully entitled to access to care from practitioners who are fully sympathetic to their point of view.

## *Education*

In education there is again a limitation on freedom of choice when it becomes virtually a State monopoly. Pro-

vision by local authorities is not significantly different from direct provision by the central government. Increasingly, central government views are being imposed on local authorities. The attitude of the present Government is that although it may not compel local authorities to introduce comprehensive schemes, it will certainly not approve new developments which are not comprehensive. So where an authority wants to build new schools to replace old or to meet needs created by population increases or movement from one part of the area to another, it will have to toe the line on comprehensives.

Comprehensive schools may, if properly organised, be perfectly satisfactory. All too often, however, comprehensive schemes are introduced which are based above all on the belief that all children from an area should go to the same school, no matter what the consequences. Whilst it may be quite satisfactory to have a comprehensive school which takes all children in an area from the age of 11 (or 12 in Scotland) up to university entrance, it is quite another matter when botched up schemes are introduced under which children may go to one school until they are 15 and are then moved on to another. This kind of scheme is particularly disastrous when an authority has a mixture of genuinely comprehensive schools which take children right up to university entrance but others only taking children up to O level. The latter schools cannot expect to recruit the same quality of teachers, for the higher levels of teaching are denied to them. Children at these schools suffer from the recruitment problems that are thus created, and from the need to change schools at 15. The egalitarian socialist is prepared to accept inequality so long as this is not based on social class or ability but is purely random.

It is common nowadays to criticise any form of separate education as socially divisive. There has been criticism of separate grammar schools for the more able. There has even been a tendency to teach children of different abilities not merely in the same school but in the same classes. There has also been criticism of the continued existence of separate

Catholic schools. It must, however, be stressed that it is the right of parents to give their children the education they want them to have. The State has the right to maintain certain minimum standards, but it has no right to try and use education for its own purposes. As to the argument that any kind of separate education is socially divisive, the truth of the matter is that any little difference is made to stand out because of the attempt that is being made to impose a uniform system.

### *Summary*

I have tried to show some of the specific disadvantages that follow from the over-extension of the role of the State in specific fields. There is an imposition on the individual of a uniform pattern of service, the individual is not free, as he should be, to choose what best suits his needs and wishes. Of course, there would be considerable difficulty in making sweeping changes at the present time. Nor could it be supposed that adequate facilities would be provided by a completely free market system. There is bound to be a vital role for the State in fields such as we have been considering, in fostering the development of facilities, and through income maintenance policies ensuring that everyone can afford them. But direct provision is far from ideal.

---

I think Catholics who condemn the campaign for justice and peace are a disgrace. Haven't they heard of the corporal and spiritual works of mercy? On balance, is television a blessing or a curse? As the unit of human nature is male and female, does not deliberate celibacy leave those who profess it less than complete?

## Any Questions ?

WILLIAM LAWSON, S.J.

I think Catholics who condemn the campaign for justice and peace are a disgrace. Haven't they heard of the corporal and spiritual works of mercy?

Do you really mean "condemn"? I have myself heard plenty of criticism, not of the campaign, but of the way it is run; but I have never heard a condemnation of the campaign itself. As you suggest, Catholics who try to follow Our Lord's teaching must admit and fulfil a responsibility for their materially and spiritually poor brethren, and they must be peacemakers. It is right that we should work for justice and peace. But you will recall other words of Our Lord besides what He said of the works of mercy. "Seek ye first the Kingdom of God and His justice"; and you know St. Paul's phrase, "the peace of God which surpasses our understanding". What is decisive in a campaign for peace and justice is the motive with which it begins, and the end it has in view. There is a world of difference between a resolve to make an earthly paradise and a determination to transform the world into an ante-chamber to the Kingdom of Heaven. What matters to every human being is that he or she is accepted into the eternal presence of God. "What does it



profit a man if he gain the whole world and suffer the loss of his soul?"

Recently I came across a quotation from the Salvation Army's Catherine Booth; "What does it matter if a man dies in the workhouse? If he dies on a doorstep covered with wounds, like Lazarus — what does it matter if his soul is saved?" It doesn't matter to him, once he has arrived at his necessary goal; but it does matter to the people who did not try to save him from the workhouse or to lift him from the doorstep and tend his wounds.

### **On balance, is television a blessing or a curse?**

In my opinion the scales come down heavily on the side of curse. That the opinion would be rejected scornfully by a majority of possessors of television sets rather confirms than disturbs me in my view, because I think the damage done by the invention (which, in itself, is admirable) arises from the fascination it has for so many. They are habituated to its use, and they become a sitting target for those who provide the programmes. Once they are accustomed to switching on their set and looking and listening, they are receptive of whatever is presented to them as news, entertainment and instruction. The harm might seem to depend entirely on the quality of the programmes, but it is already done when people have grown used to taking regular doses of what is offered them. Their habit makes them gullible, whether they are gulled or not. They are willing customers of those who decide what shall be considered news, entertainment and instruction. They have surrendered their minds. The controllers of television can (and do) control taste and judgement, because it is they who decide what vast numbers of the populace shall see and hear; and only a small minority of that multitude is sufficiently alert and independent to make a sound critical assessment of what comes from the transmitting stations. Under tyrannical regimes nothing goes over the air except what is approved by the tyrants. In what are optimistically called free societies, it is not the free viewer who composes,

for example, the news broadcasts. To fit into the time allowed, a news broadcast has to be a selection from a mass of facts or allegations; and it is given with little or no indication of how the selection has been made or what has been omitted.

**As the unit of human nature is male and female, does not deliberate celibacy leave those who profess it less than complete?**

One answer to your question is given by the American, H. L. Mencken. I hope it is not an answer that harmonizes with your own thought. He says, "A nun, at best, is only half a woman, just as a priest is only half a man." That sounds smart, but it is, in fact, particularly stupid, as it misses the real meaning of the truth at the beginning of your question: that the unit of human nature is male and female. So it is. Each one, male and female, has the essentials of human nature independently of the other. Each has body and soul; each is a human person. Every human person needs to enter into loving relationships with other persons, otherwise personality cannot attain its perfections. Each sex has its special goodnesses of personality, and each can enrich the other by the communication of what the other can have only by gift — outlooks, insights, sensitivities, virtues which are somehow special. The highest kind of communication is in the love of friendship.

It is to the love of friendship with Him that we are called by God. In God are, in endless measure, those goodnesses which in their human form we call femininity and masculinity. God is Father and Mother, and Spouse of the soul. The fullest development of human personality is reached by a love of God which is wholehearted and undivided, and it is to the direct and complete love of God that consecrated chastity dedicates itself. Some of the strongest and most attractive personalities in history are those of men and women, priests and nuns, who are canonized Saints; and for each one of those, there are thousands, not canonized, but

with a comparable deep self-possession and strength of love. And their love of God is a measure of the love they bear their fellow-human beings.

**Has the rethinking of obedience in religious life affected the understanding of a wife's obedience in Christian marriage?**

To be blunt, I have only the sketchiest notion of how the rethinking of obedience in religious life has affected the obedience of religious to their superiors, so I should have nothing with which to compare authority and obedience in Christian marriage, supposing I knew how they had been exercised in recent years. I don't know even how to assess the "rethinking". You seem to consider it a completed job that has arrived at conclusions fixed and universally accepted. If that is your opinion, you are wrong. Large areas of religious life are still quaking with continual attacks on traditional obedience and on the structures which depend on it. Most married Christians, thank goodness, know nothing of this rethinking, so their own structures remain solid and secure. The family is the original human society; and religious communities and Congregations, which are also societies, could, at need, rediscover some of the essentials of their constitution by having a good look at the family. Without authority and the corresponding obedience it would not be a society at all, and civil society would lack its necessary foundation. Authority and obedience are exercised as part of the loving relationships made by membership of natural and supernatural societies. They cannot be dispensed with — they are, as it were, the skeleton of a living organism. Love could have its place even in the exercise of authority and obedience in civil society. The law of loving one's neighbour as oneself is universal, and governments and citizens should keep it. Where relationships are supernatural, as in Christian marriage and in religious life, charity should enliven all duties especially those that are reciprocal, as are the corresponding duties of governing and cooperating with government.

**How can prayer of petition be sincere when God's immutable answer to it was made from all eternity?**

Because God's immutable answer took into account your sincere prayer of petition which He knew in His eternity.

When Our Lord tells us that we should pray without ceasing He is encouraging us not to try to change God but to try to change ourselves. We depend on God for all that we are and all that we have. We exist only because God keeps us in existence. Not to know our dependence on Him is not to know the primary fact about ourselves — and that is an ignorance which could be fatal. We must know that our happiness comes from being poor in spirit, acknowledging that without God we are and have nothing, and therefore letting Him hear "the voice of our supplication".

Prayer of petition covers a multitude of needs. If, using the phrase, you have in mind only the temporal benefits, even what are called "the necessities of life", you might be slow to think that certain dispositions are required in us if we are to receive what we ask for. We can't, for example, be forgiven our offences against God unless we are willing to accept forgiveness. We have to admit our need of mercy before the infinite mercy of God can operate within us. To confess our sin before God is a necessary step before we can be cleansed from our sin. As forgiveness presupposes repentance, we make that petition in our prayer — to be sorry for our sin. The forgiveness of God is from eternity, but so, in His foreknowledge, is our desire for it.

---

# Book Review

## THE WINDSOR AGREEMENT

**The Eucharist — Unity or Truth?**, Faith-Keyway Publications; available at £1 post-free from Pro Fide Book Service, 39 Blenheim Park Road, South Croydon, Surrey.

“I believe that the Holy Supper of the Lord is not a sacrifice, but only a remembrance and commemoration of this holy sacrifice of Jesus Christ. Therefore it ought not to be worshipped as God, neither as Christ therein contained; who must be worshipped in faith only, without all corruptible elements. Likewise I believe and confess that the popish Mass is the invention of man, a sacrifice of Antichrist, and a forsaking of the sacrifice of Jesus Christ, that is to say of his death and passion; and that it is a stinking and infected sepulchre, which hideth and covereth the merit of the blood of Christ; and therefore ought the Mass to be abolished, and the holy Supper of the Lord to be restored and set in his perfection again.” — John Hooper, Bishop of Gloucester; *A Brief and Clear Confession of the Christian Faith*.

“Consecration is the separation of any thing from a profane and worldly use into a spiritual and godly use . . . when common bread and wine be taken and severed from other bread and wine, *although it be of the same substance that the other is from which it is severed*, yet it is now called consecrated, or holy bread, and holy wine. *Not that the bread and wine have or can have any holiness in them*, but that they be used to a holy work, and represent holy and godly things.” — Thomas Cranmer; *A Defence of the True and Catholic Doctrine* . . .

When reports first appeared in the Catholic Press that a joint Anglican-Catholic Commission had reached “substantial agreement on the doctrine of the eucharist”, so that “this doctrine will no longer constitute an obstacle to the unity we



seek", I was considerably surprised. This surprise caused me to blot my ecumenical copy book by sending a letter to the *Catholic Herald* which might well have been the first public criticism of the now notorious Windsor Agreement. The question I posed to the authors of the Agreement is basic to the whole discussion:

"When, as an Anglican, I was receiving instruction with a view to becoming a Catholic, it was made very plain to me that I must offer the worship of *latria*, worship due to God alone, to the only begotten Son of God present in the Consecrated Host both during or after the Mass. It was made equally clear to me by my Anglican minister that this teaching was, apart from what he regarded as an unrepresentative minority, incompatible with Anglican belief.

"If substantial agreement has been reached, it is clear that either the Anglican side has agreed that the worship of *latria* must be offered to the Blessed Sacrament, whether reserved in the tabernacle or exposed for our adoration during Benediction, or that the Catholic side has agreed that it must not. If this is not the case there can be no substantial agreement . . ."

A close study of the document itself, and the subsequent debate, make it clear that neither side considers its position to have changed and that what the Commission has discovered is that really we all believe the same thing. What, in fact, the learned and reverend gentlemen are telling me is that, when I renounced the Church of England and became a Catholic, ceased believing one doctrine concerning the Eucharist and accepted a new one, I was, in fact, believing the same thing all the time. What, in fact, the learned and reverend gentlemen are telling me is that my Anglican minister who regretted my abandoning Anglican truth for Roman error was worrying about nothing, at least where the Eucharist is concerned, for my Anglican belief had not changed; and the priest who received me and rejoiced that I had abandoned Anglican error for Catholic truth rejoiced without cause, as I was still believing what I had believed before.

Had the reverend and learned gentlemen deigned to reply to my letter they might possibly have explained that, as an unlearned and obviously irreverent layman, I could not possibly be expected to understand their brave new Agreement. My reply would have been that any agreement on so important a topic not easily comprehensible to the average layman was totally useless as a step in constructive ecumenical dialogue. If they expect the hundreds of thousands of converts living in this country, who are familiar with Anglican and Catholic teaching, to believe that both are identical where the Eucharist is concerned then clear and convincing arguments will be needed. No such arguments are to be found in the Windsor Agreement.

By a strange irony of history it seems that the thirteen divines who met to compile the first Anglican Prayer Book, that of 1549, were commonly called the "Windsor Commission". In his magisterial work, *Eucharistic Sacrifice and the Reformation* <sup>(1)</sup>, the authoritative study of the differences between Anglican and Catholic belief where the Eucharist is concerned, Francis Clark explains (on p. 182) that this first prayer book was an ingenious essay in ambiguity. It "could not be convicted of overt heresy, for it was adroitly framed and contained no express denial of pre-Reformation doctrine. It was, as an Anglican scholar puts it, 'an ingenious essay in ambiguity', purposely worded in such a manner that the more conservative could place their own construction upon it and reconcile their consciences to using it, while the Reformers would use it in their own sense and would recognise it as *an instrument for furthering the next stage of the religious revolution*". (My emphasis.) The Faith Movement has provided an immense service to the Church by proving quite conclusively in the book under review that the Windsor Agreement is an equally ingenious essay in ambiguity; by presenting the truth about this Agreement the Authors have also rendered an immense service to the ecumenical movement which cannot progress without truth as its foundation. To quote the Vatican II Decree on Ecumenism: "It is, of course, essential that doctrine be presented in its entirety.

Nothing is so foreign to the spirit of ecumenism as a false conciliatory approach which harms the purity of Catholic doctrine and obscures its assured genuine meaning".

The manner in which the ambiguous wording of the Agreement makes it possible for Catholics and Anglicans to interpret an identical passage in a contradictory manner is illustrated on p. 56. Bishop Clark explains to the Catholic readers of his commentary on the Statement that where Section 5 is concerned: "In fact the whole thrust of the reasoning here is that the Eucharist makes present the once-for-all Sacrifice of Christ here and now . . . ."

Dr. J. W. Charley, in a Commentary for Anglican readers, provides a somewhat different exegesis: "What is made present is not the historical sacrifice of Christ itself but the efficacy of it".

After providing a series of such contradictory statements in parallel columns Fr. Gerard Butcher aptly comments: ". . . the Agreement does seem to be based on accidents of language rather than the substance of doctrine". No doubt Bishop Clark and Dr. Charley will feel that Fr. Butcher has been guilty of unsportsmanlike conduct in reading the Anglican Commentary: Catholics were clearly intended to read only Bishop Clark's exposition!

The Windsor Agreement on the Eucharist has now been followed by the Canterbury Agreement on the Ministry. In his Commentary on this second agreed statement, Dr. Charley returns to the question of whether or not the Windsor Agreement accepted that the Eucharist was a sacrifice.<sup>(2)</sup> His answer is as refreshingly clear as the texts of the official statements themselves are depressingly wooly. ". . . any suggestion of the sacrifice of Christ being somehow continued in heaven and represented by priests at altars on earth is positively excluded". (p. 22) "The Statement on the Eucharist claimed to be a 'substantial agreement' from which, according to the Chairmen in the Preface, 'nothing essential has been omitted'. That Statement spoke explicitly of the sacrifice of Christ, but it never described the eucharist as a sacrifice. Even a 'substantial agreement' did not require

that". (p. 23.)

One of the most valuable features of the book under review is an appendix containing a wealth of texts "in English translation of the official teaching of the Sacred Magisterium of the Roman Catholic Church on the Holy Eucharist, True Sacrifice and Real Presence of Jesus Christ". (p. 107.) These texts prove clearly that it is the *official* teaching of the Catholic Church that the historical reality of the sacrifice of Christ is made present in the Mass and not simply its efficacy. They might usefully be supplemented by the following: "Christ is offered today and He Himself, as priest, offers Himself in order that He may remit our sins." — St. Ambrose.<sup>(3)</sup> St. Cyprian explains: "The Passion of the Lord is the sacrifice we offer".<sup>(4)</sup> St. Thomas Aquinas teaches explicitly that the Mass is the sacrifice of the Cross.<sup>(5)</sup> Dr. Charley quite clearly does not believe this and so there is obviously no agreement on the nature of the eucharist between even the Catholic and Anglican members of the Joint Commission.

A thesis still popular among some Anglo-Catholics is that the Anglican Reformers did not reject authentic Catholic teaching on the Mass but only abuses and distortions which had crept in during the late middle ages. They even profess to be able to interpret the Thirty-Nine Articles in a Catholic sense. In the book already referred to, Francis Clark has torn every shred of credibility from both these theories. His book has obviously proved unpopular with Anglo-Catholics but, as he points out in the preface to the most recent edition, no attempt has been made to refute his thesis on a scholarly level. Anyone who reads *A Defence of the True and Catholic Doctrine of the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of our Saviour Jesus Christ, with a Confutation of Sundry Errors concerning the Same*, by Thomas Cranmer, will certainly agree that he explicitly repudiates the authentic Catholic teaching *which he fully understands*. Indeed, as an Archbishop, it would have been very strange had he not done so and it is insulting to him to suggest that he did not. It is therefore of considerable interest to note what Cranmer

considers to be the key aspects of Catholic teaching on the Mass. He is very clear about what these are; narrows them down to two; returns to them and rejects them, not simply frequently but obsessively.

"But what availeth it to take away beads, pardons, pilgrimages, and such other popery, as long as two chief roots remain unpulled up? Whereof, so long as they remain, will spring again all former impediments of the Lord's harvest, and corruption of his flock. The rest is but branches and leaves, the cutting away whereof is but like the topping and lopping of a tree, or cutting down of weeds, leaving the body standing and the roots in the ground; but the very body of the tree, or rather the roots of the weeds, is the popish doctrine of transubstantiation, of the real presence of Christ's flesh and blood in the sacrament of the altar (as they call it), and the sacrifice and oblation of Christ made by the priest in the salvation of the quick and the dead". (6)

It is certainly significant (to use the popular phrase) that it is precisely on these two points that the Windsor Statement is most unsatisfactory. This point is made by Fr. Knowles in his introduction to the book under review. Fr. David Knowles is probably our most distinguished living Catholic scholar, and anyone seeking an example of ecumania in action will find it in the fact that a pamphlet which the C.T.S. had invited him to write upon the Mass was rejected for reasons involving ecumenism.(7) In another act of great service to the Catholic community, the Faith Movement has published it as a pamphlet.(8) It is worth pointing out that the Faith priests have published this pamphlet (plus a number of others), and the book under review, at their own expense; they do not have the financial resources of the C.T.S. or the Ecumenical Commission to back their printing efforts. It is their belief that there will be sufficient Catholics with a love of the Church and consequent love of the truth who will be prepared to support publications designed to defend these complementary causes. The least that the rest of us can do is to make the modest financial outlay to prove them right, particularly in view of the fact that the C.T.S.



has now banned the sale of *Faith* from its London bookshop.

Returning to the lack of clarity concerning the two doctrines which lie at the basis of Catholic teaching on the Mass, as Cranmer and a legion of reformers testify, Mgr. Philip Flanagan asks some very pertinent questions in an article reprinted from *The Keys of Peter*, a lay edited bi-monthly dedicated to the defence of orthodoxy<sup>(9)</sup> and now also banned by the C.T.S. Referring to the widespread anxiety evoked by the ambiguity of the Windsor Statement in regard to these key-doctrines, Monsignor Flanagan wrote: "If there is no deliberate ambiguity in the Statement — and we have been assured that there is none — it is strange that the delegates did not foresee doubts of this kind and try to prevent them by greater clarity. As it is, it would be imprudent to accept this statement as an accurate account of Catholic doctrine till certain questions have been asked and answered by the signatories. Does the Sacrifice of the Mass include the offering to God by the priest and people, in union with Christ, of the Victim who offered Himself on the Cross and is now present in the Eucharist? Is Christ present in the Eucharist when it is reserved in the tabernacle or elsewhere? Do the bread and wine remain once Christ has become present in the Eucharist? It is only after questions like these have been answered clearly that we shall know whether or not the Agreed Statement does in fact accurately reflect Catholic Faith in the Eucharist". (p. 25)

The fact that such questions can be asked by a scholar of the standing of Mgr. Flanagan (former Rector of the Scots' College, Rome) makes it quite clear that the Statement does not reflect Catholic teaching. This point is brought home time and again throughout the book by other scholars of the calibre of T. S. Gregory, Fr. John McKee, Fr. E. Holloway and Fr. Charles Boyer, S.J. (It is worth asking why men like this are *never* included on official commissions; there *must* be some sort of moral here.)

The ethos of the Windsor Agreement is perhaps best conveyed by one of its statements and a comment by T. S. Gregory. Here is the statement: "In the Eucharistic Prayer,

the Church continues to make a perpetual memorial of Christ's death, and his members united with God and one another, give thanks for all his mercies, entreat the benefits of his passion on behalf of the whole Church, participate in these benefits and enter into the movement of his self-offering". As T. S. Gregory explains, this is, indeed, "an ingenious essay in ambiguity". He continues: "This is a safely 'agreed syllabus' description of the total religious exercise of the entire Protestant population of Europe and America. Like the famous Miss Fuller, 'we accept the universe'. What it has to do specifically with the Eucharist or with the business of the Commission is by no means clear. But this vague omnibus is characteristic of the document as a whole (as indeed it is characteristic of the Anglican Church), so reduced to statements which everyone can accept that it says nothing at all". (p. 39)

The plainest speaking in the book under review, as those who know him would expect, comes from Fr. Edward Holloway. Commenting on the failure of the Agreement to teach "*that the Eucharist is a sacrifice as well as a sacrament*", Fr. Holloway states: "I do not hesitate to stigmatise this omission as a betrayal and misrepresentation of the basic Catholic position, in East and West, and to add that these sections represent either a lack of theological integrity, or else a neo-Modernist and Humanist deviation from Roman Catholic doctrine in the theologians concerned". Uncharitable language? But can true charity be divorced from truth? Fr. Holloway is the servant of a Master who did not hesitate to call a whited sepulchre a whited sepulchre or to whip the money changers out of the temple.

Part III of the book is extremely depressing. The reader is taken on a series of journeys around the Agreed Statement, mostly by Anglican writers to whom he is introduced by Fr. Roger Nesbitt. It is depressing for a number of reasons: it makes it clear that there is no hope whatsoever in the foreseeable future of any corporate return of the Anglican Communion to the unity of the Catholic Church, short of a direct intervention by God, which we have no reason and

no right to expect. It proves how impossible it is to discover any such thing as Anglican belief, as opposed to the belief of some Anglicans—a very different matter. It proves that what some of these Anglicans believe cannot possibly be reconciled with irreformable Catholic teaching. It also proves that the obsession with ecumenism currently afflicting so many of our Catholic clergy at every level is ill-advised: while the faith of so many of their flock is ebbing so swiftly, and probably irrevocably, they are devoting themselves to a cause that will not succeed and, if it did, would have little effect on the evangelisation of this country.

The book has also succeeded in a respect which its authors probably did not intend; it arouses very serious anxieties concerning the new rite of Mass itself. It would not be an exaggeration to claim that the New Mass is the liturgical expression of the Windsor Agreement. It was defined in the original *Institutio Generalis* as “the sacred assembly or gathering of the people of God, with a priest presiding to celebrate the memorial of the Lord. For this reason, the promise of Christ is particularly true of the local congregation of the Church: ‘Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there I am in the midst of them’ ”.

The immediate response is: “Pure Windsor Statement!” However, as the New Mass preceded the Windsor Statement it might be more accurate to refer to the latter as “Pure New Mass!” Although this inadequate definition of the Mass has now been improved, together with other errors and inadequacies in the original *Institutio Generalis*, the text of the New Mass which corresponds so closely to this definition, remains unchanged. While there are certain points in the text and rubrics which could not be accepted by evangelicals, it is quite clear that it goes almost all the way to meeting their demands—a useful “instrument for furthering the next stage of the religious revolution”. A careful analysis will reveal that, as a general rule, what Cranmer rejected, the New Mass rejects. Vatican II demanded that nothing in the Mass should be changed unless the good of



the Church genuinely and certainly required it. It seems strange, to say the least, that the prayers which the good of the Church genuinely and certainly required should be changed, happened to be those very prayers which evoked the wrath of Cranmer and other Protestant reformers. Such prayers as the *Suscipe Sancte Pater*, the *Offerimus Tibi* and *Placeat tibi* would certainly have been an obstacle to the ecumenical ethos of the *Windsor Statement* had they not been abolished.

It is also interesting to note that there has been co-operation between Anglicans and Catholics in drawing up the new Mass and the new Anglican Series III liturgy. Material not found in the Eucharistic liturgy of either communion has suddenly appeared in both; and it is a fact that the Consilium which drew up the new Mass included advisers from the Anglican and other Protestant bodies.

An extract from Dr. Charley's commentary on the Statement, which is quoted in the book under review, makes the following point:

"Much of what Kung has called 'the valid demands of the Reformers' has now been met by the Church of Rome in the new Eucharistic Prayers, even though in these there remain echoes of the pre-Reformation language of Eucharistic Sacrifice . . ." (p.55.)

There's a remark to give us food for thought! I am sure that many laymen would be grateful if the authors of this book would now turn their attention to the far more important question of precisely what is being done to the Liturgy of the Mass, for the reform is by no means at an end and there seem to be new changes every month or so. During 1973, for example, faculties have been granted for the composition of yet more Eucharistic Prayers and for lay people to distribute Communion.

In the introduction to his Commentary on the Windsor Statement Bishop Clark explains that this has been made necessary because: "From the mixed reception which the *Agreed Statement* has received at home and abroad, it is clear that the nature, the consequences, and the authority of

the document . . . are not immediately evident". *The Eucharist: Unity of Truth* makes it clear that the nature and consequences of the Agreed Statement have been fully appreciated by the authors of this book; and its message is quite clear—that there are Catholic ecumenists who consider that unity takes priority over truth. This is a serious conclusion to make, but it is the only possible conclusion to be derived from an objective reading of *The Eucharist: Unity or Truth*. Buy it and find out for yourself.

During the First World War a party of German soldiers arrived at the doors of a Convent in Belgium. Terrified by allied propaganda, which had convinced most civilians that, where barbarity was concerned, the German Imperial Army certainly had the edge over Attila the Hun, the Reverend Mother took it upon herself to remove the Blessed Sacrament from the tabernacle and conceal it beneath her robe. When the Germans entered, their officer noticed that she was concealing something. "What do you have there?" he demanded.

"Behold your God!" replied the nun, holding our Saviour before them. As one man the soldiers knelt; they were Catholic Bavarians.

Would the Anglican signatories to the Windsor Agreement have knelt? Somehow I think not. Until they make a public statement to the effect that they would, I shall continue to believe that, when I became a Catholic, I changed one set of beliefs for another; and that, in doing this, I found both unity and truth for which, with all due deference to the liturgical reform, I never fail to say my daily *Deo Gratias*; a *Deo Gratias* which I now extend to include the authors of, *The Eucharist; Unity or Truth?*

Michael Davies.

Notes:

1. Available from the Pro Fide Book Service; £4 post free.
2. *Agreements on the Doctrine of the Ministry*, J. W. Charley, Grove Books, 20p.
3. *De Officiis Ministrorum*.
4. Epistle LXIII.
5. ST. III, Q 83, art. 1.
6. *The Defence of the True Catholic Doctrine of the Sacrament* (1550).
7. See Faith, May 1973, p. 26.
8. Available from the Pro Fide Book Service at 13p, post free.
9. Specimen copy free from; 4 Boscombe Ave., London, E10 6HY.